

Interview Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/419,517	KAESEMEYER, WAYNE H.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer Kim	1617	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jennifer Kim. (3) ____.

(2) Mr. Ray Miller. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 05 June 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-6, 12, 13, 16-26.

Identification of prior art discussed: ____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW: See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

THEODORE J. CRIARES
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200
1600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The general nature of the claims were discussed including submission of 131 declaration to overcome "new matter" rejection made in last Office Action. "synergistic effective amounts" were suggested by the Examiner, however, the attorney of the record asserted that the crux of the invention is the novelty of the combination of Nitric Oxide Synthase and HmgCoA reuctase inhibitors. The attorney also recalled the parent case (U.S.Patent 5,968,983) claimed the species of the HmgCOA reuctase in combination of L-arginine in treatment of a disease condition related to vasodilation or vasorelaxation..